

THE
DOCTRINE and PRACTICE
OF THE
CHURCH
OF
SCOTLAND,
ABOUT THE
Sacrament of Baptism.

VINDICATED
From the Charge of Gross Error

EXHIBITED

In a Print called, *The Practice and Doctrine of the Presbyterian Preachers, about the Sacrament of Baptism, Examined.*

PART II. *By me Haddo pro
fess of i. b. m. i. z.*

EDINBURGH,

Printed by George Mosman, and are to be sold at his Shop in the
Parliament Closs. M. DCC. IV.

DOCTRINE and PRACTICE

OF THE

CHURCH

OF

SCOTLAND.

ABOUT THE

Separation of Baptism

AND



From the Charge of Gross Error

EXHIBITED

In and called, by the Practice and Doctrine of the Presby-
tery, Baptists, and the Separation of Baptism,
Amended.

PART II.

EDINBURGH.

Printed by James Ballantyne, and are to be sold at his Shop in the
Parliament Close, M. DCC. LV.

PART II.

CHAP. I. *Of Publick and Private Baptism.*

BEcause sound Doctrine is the surest Foundation of Right Practice, I therefore judged it meet to premise the Examination of this Authors Charge against the Doctrine of Presbyterians concerning the Necessity of Baptism: I shall now in the Method formerly proposed, return to the Consideration of his first Charge, which respects their Practice in the Administration of this Sacrament.

“ Nothing is more notorious Matter of Fact, [*says our Author page 4*] than that they universally refuse to Baptize, unless it be on a Sunday, or some other set preaching Day of the Week, even tho they are informed, that the Children are more likely to die, than to live one Day; and tho the Parents are willing [notwithstanding that critical Circumstance] to carry their Children to Church to be Baptized.

This is so notoriously false, that there is no person in this Kingdom, of any tolerable acquaintance with the Practice of Presbyterian Ministers, who are not convinced of its being so. It were uncharitable to think, that any under the Character of a Clergy man would be so impudent as to aver so notorious a Falshood against his Knowledge. Wherefore the most favourable construction, I can put upon this Assertion is, that this Author must be an utter Stranger to the common and general Practice of Presbyterian Ministers, since the Re-establishing of their Government, at the late Happy Revolution. The Truth is, their Baptizing at other times, than on Sundays or other set Preaching Days, and, in some Cases, in other places than in the Church, is so frequent in many places of the Nation, that I judge it will be more difficult to vindicate this their practice from a Violation of our Constitutions, than to justify the Canons of our Church, against privat Baptism.

But let us at present suppose the Truth of this Charge, that Presbyterians did universally refuse to administer Baptism, except in the Face of the Congregation assembled for Divine Worship. What evil is in this? Our Author says p 4. *It is a cruel delay of Baptism* and p. 5. *periculum in mora, Children sometimes die and often may, before the Day of Preaching is come.* To this I Answer.

1. If indeed Baptism were so necessary, as our Author pretends, that without it none are regenerated and pardoned, and therefore not in a salvable Condition, on the ordinary Terms of the Covenant of Grace, I acknowledge there were great danger in delay, and it were Cruelty to refuse it. But seeing he hath not evinced any such Necessity or Efficacy to be in Baptism, seeing we have shewed

the Weakness of his Arguments, and proven the contrary; All this pretended Danger and Cruelty vanisheth: For Childrens Interest in the Covenant antecedent to Baptism, is the ground of their being Baptised.

2. If Baptism were the only mean of Regeneration and Remission, and on that account necessary to Salvation, as our Author pleads: Then every Child ought to be Baptised as soon as Born, for *periculum in mora* there is danger in delay, and all publick Baptism should be condemned, and so all the Christian Churches were culpable, who allow and commend the publick Administration of this Sacrament; seeing by many sudden Accidents, the tender Life of a new-born Infant may be quickly snatched away, even tho it appear lively and in health for the time, before Baptism can be publicly administred. So that our Author must condemn all the Christian Churches of Implety and Cruelty, in appointing the publick Administration of Baptism by Ecclesiastick Constitution. The Reverend and Learned *Wusius* Professor of Divinity at *Leiden* prosecutes this Consideration very elegantly in his Exercitation *de Efficacia Baptismi* Sect. 74. 'Attamen & Reformatæ Ecclesiæ Baptismum administrare non solet, nisi statim publicarum concionum locis ac temporibus; extantque ea de re ubivis fere Ecclesiasticæ Constitutiones: Sed si verum illud esset, & pro vero communiter habitum, quod Infantes ad usque Baptismum maneat Filii iræ, neque amentur a Deo amore Complacentiæ, & relinquantur in reatu Peccati originalis; & in Baptismo certe regenerentur, sine Baptismo autem non servantur nisi per miraculum; non modo durum & iniquum, sed & tyrannicum, impium, sacrilegum, & plusquam Parricidium foret, Baptismum certo tempori alligare; ne ullum quidem prætermittendum esset momentum, ut charissima pignora, mox a partu reatu Peccati Originalis solvantur, e statu iræ in statum Gratiæ transferantur, & in certâ æternæ felicitatis expectatione collocentur. Proh impios Parentes, qui vel ad horæ momentum oriosi cessent? impiam Ecclesiam, quæ male feriatis Constitutionibus suis venientes adarceat, petentibus negat! Impios Sacrorum Ministros, qui non omni loco, omni tempore, ad tam necessariæ pietatis Officiû præsto sint!

3. Supposing what we have already proven, that Baptism is not of such Necessity as our Author pretends, for conferring the Grace of Regeneration and Remission, nor the want of it so dangerous, as to exclude the Un-baptized from a salvable Condition: Why may not the decent and orderly Administration of this Sacrament be determined by Ecclesiastick Constitutions, that are no way opposite, but conformable to the Word of God? Seeing Baptism is a publick Ordinance, Sealing our Interest in the Covenant of Grace, and openly testifying our initiation into the Christian Church: And if the Church may lawfully establish such Constitutions for the publick Administration of Baptism, are Ministers justly to be blamed, who pay a due respect to these Constitutions, by a regular observance of them.

What hath been said may suffice to take off this Authors grievous Charge of Presbyterians horrid Cruelty, seeing it is both false and groundless: Yet that this matter may be set in a more full light, I shall First Consider the Constitutions and Practice of this Church from the Reformation, with the Grounds and Reasons thereof.

thereof. And Secondly, I shall compare these with the Constitutions and Practice of other Reformed Churches.

First. It is plain that the Church of Scotland, from the Reformation, hath maintained and defended the publick Administration of this Sacrament, and disproved private Baptism. In the first Book of Discipline, we have the Judgement of our Reformers in this matter, in the 9th Head, concerning the Policy of the Kirk. "It appertains to the Policy of the Kirk, to appoint the times, when the Sacraments shall be Ministred. Baptism may be Ministred, whensoever the word is Preached, But we think it more expedient, that it be Ministred upon Sunday, or upon the Day of Prayers only after the Sermon; partly to remove this gross Error, by the which many are deceived, thinking that Children be Damned, if they Die without Baptism; And partly to make the people have greater reverence to the Administration of the Sacraments than they have. In the Assembly which met at Edinburgh October 18, 1581. It was concluded, that no Sacrament be Administred in a private House, but Solemnly, according to the good Order hitherto observed, under pain of Deposition to the Minister, Petrie Hist. Pt. 2. pag. 411.

This good order continued without alteration, until the Five Famous Articles of Perth were concluded anno 1618, whereof private Baptism was one. These occasioned no small Division and Confusion in this Church: and K. C. 1st. to perfect the work sent down in An. 1636 A Book of Common Prayer, Canons &c. Established by his sole Prerogative Royal, and Supreme Authority in Causes Ecclesiastick. In the Book of Canons Chap. 6. § 2. It is Ordained, That, 'no Presbyter shall refuse, or delay, to Christen any Child presented by the Parents, or any one of them, assisted by two or three Witnesses; although the same be no ordinary Hour of Sermon. And though all the people be admonished, to observe the Lords Day, for Celebration of the Sacrament of Baptism, so far as they may, and to bring their Infants for that effect, unto the Church; Yet Consideration must be had of the Childrens Infirmary, and in that case the Presbyter shall not refuse to go where the Infant remaineth and Baptise the same. The practice of these Innovations was severely pressed by the then Bishops, but opposed by the Patrons of the Ancient Discipline, and Body of the Nation: until at last a free General Assembly was obtained in anno 1638. to meet at Glasgow, for composing of Differences in the Affairs of the Church. This Assembly in one consent, one only excepted, did condemn the Five Articles of Perth, and prohibited the observing of them, by their Act, Sess. 17. December 10. The General Assembly Anno 1645. by their Act, February 3d. Approved of the Directory for publick Worship, wherein it is declared, in the Head concerning the Administration of the Sacraments, 'That Baptism, as it is not unnecessarily to be delayed, so is it not to be Administred in any case by any private person; but by a Minister of Christ. Nor is it to be Administred in private places, or privatly, but in the place of publick Worship, and in the Face of the Congregation, where the people may most conveniently see and hear; and not in places where Fonts in the time of Popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed. The same Assembly February 7. in the Approbation of some Overtures for keeping greater uniformity in the practice and observation of the Directory in some points of publick Worship, give it as their Judgement.

" That

‘That in the Administration of Baptism, it will be convenient, That that Sacrament be Administred in face of the Congregation, that what is spoken and done may be heard and seen of all, and that it be Administred after the Sermon, before the Blessing. These Orders and Constitutions were never Ecclesiastically repealed in this Church, even during the late Prelacy: and were confirmed by the first General Assembly after the late happy Revolution, in anno 1690, *Act anent the Administration of the Sacraments* where the Assembly ‘Discharges the Administration of Baptism in private, that is, in any place, or at any time, when the Congregation is not orderly called together, to wait on the dispensing of the Word, And appoints that this be carefully observed when and wherever the Lord giveth his people peace, Liberty, and opportunity for their Publick Assemblies.

Next we may enquire into the Grounds and Reasons of these Constitutions, why our Church hath prohibited private Baptism, and appointed the Sacrament to be Administred in Face of the Congregation? In the *First Book of Discipline*, before cited, there are two Reasons mentioned. 1. ‘That by this means, the gross Error, that Children be Damned, if they Die without Baptism, may be removed. 2. That the people might have greater Reverence to the Administration of the Sacraments. 3. A third Reason is mentioned by the Assembly in Anno 1638. out of the Book of Common Order, ‘That the Sacraments are not to be used in private Corners, as Charmers and Sorcerers use to do. So the publick Administration of Baptism is appointed to prevent the corrupt abuse of it as a Charme. 4. In the fore-cited Act of Assembly Anno 1645. And in the Directory: the Edification of the People is made a Reason of the Publick Administration of Baptism, *That what is spoken and done may be heard and seen of all.* In the *Act of Assembly Anno 1690*. Another Reason is added, from the nature and design of the Sacraments, ‘That they are Christs Solemn Ordinances, and Seals of the Covenant of Grace (which is held forth in the Preaching of the Gospel) and that in the use of them, the parties receiving them, are solemnly devoted and engaged to GOD, before Angels and Men; and are solemnly received as Members of the Church, and do entertain Communion with her. These and other Reasons are enlarged and more fully pleaded, in *Nulity of the Perth Assembly*, and in *Altare Damascenum*. Particularly, that Baptism, being the Ceremony of our entrance into the visible Church, and a Sign and Badge of our Christian Profession before the World, it is fuitable that this Ordinance of our Reception into the Church be as solemn and publick as Excommunication, or Ejection out of the Church, which ought to be publick and made known unto all. Also that many Corruptions and Inconveniences have followed, and may follow upon the practice of private Baptism; Such are, the cherishing of Error and Superstition in the Minds of Ignorant People, concerning the vertue and absolute necessity of Baptism, private persons, and even Women taking upon them to be Baptizers, upon the pretended necessity; The omitting of Prayer and instruction at the Administration of this Sacrament, through fear and haste, upon the pretended hazard; the introducing of a new Conditional Baptism, in case of suspicion that any thing essential hath been omitted in private, with the danger of Hereticks creeping in on such occasions, and

of the ordinance, its being depraved by adding Rites in the administration thereof nor warranted by the Word of God, nor allowed in this Church.

These being the Grounds and Reasons pleaded by Presbyterians, against the private, and for the publick Administration of this Sacrament, if our Author had dealt fairly, as became a candid Disputant, he should have examined them in particular, and not have insisted so long, in *pag. 4 and 5.* upon that one Text *Matth: 28: 19.* Nor so confidently have asserted, *That Presbyterians refuse to administer Baptism, for no other reason, but because the day appointed for delivering their Notions on a particular Text of Scripture is not come.* For as I know no Presbyterians who refuse to administer Baptism for no other reason, than what he here alledgeth; So, from what hath been said on this Subject, he may know, that not only the ground he pleads for Private Baptism, as the necessary means of Regeneration and Remission, is accounted groundless, and sufficiently refuted by Presbyterians: But also, that they give other weighty Reasons, for the publick Administration of this Ordinance, which he hath not touched. And as to that Text *Matth: 28: 19.* I think Presbyterians will not contend with him, about the interpretation of the words, *Προσδίδις ἐν ὁνόματι* &c. whether they be rendered, *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations;* or *Disciple all Nations:* If he shall grant them two things. 1. That Teaching and Baptizing are joyn'd together in this Text; And Baptism being an appendix and Seal of the Word, appointed for the confirmation of our Faith in the Gospel, it is congruous, that it be also joyned with teaching in practice. 2. That Baptism being here committed to the same Persons, to whom the power of teaching is given, it ought not to be administered by any Man or Woman, but only by a Minister of the Word. Yet I know not if this will be granted by Our Author, seeing I find in the *Book of Canons for Scotland, Chap. 6.* these words, *For as much as none have ordinary power to administer the Sacraments, but such as are in holy Orders &c.* which seems plainly to insinuate, that Lay Persons, as they call them, have allowed unto them, an Extraordinary power to Baptize in case of the pretended Necessity.

CHAP. II. Of the Constitutions and Practice of Reformed Churches about the Administration of Baptism.

HAVING thus exhibited the Constitutions and Practice of the Church of Scotland from the Reformation, with the Grounds and Reasons thereof; I come in the *second* place to compare These, with the Judgement and practice of other Reformed Churches. And if the like Constitutions and Practice shall be found in other Churches, I leave it to the unbiased Reader to judge, from what principle it is, that this Author impeaches the *Scotts Presbyterians* as if they were Singular in this matter.

I shall begin with *The Order of the Reformed in Bohemia*, lately translated from the Edition of *John-Amos Comenius*, by one of our Episcopal Clergy (as is supposed) who hath prefixed to it a commendatory Preface. In this Order I find no
allow

allowance for private Baptism, but all the Administration therein mentioned is publick. In p. 26. of the *Form of Baptism*, it is said, *They administer Baptism after the Example of the Primitive Church. 1st. The Children of the Faithful, some days after they are born, are presented to be ingrafted into Christ and the Church.* It seems they are not much affraid of our Authors *Periculum in mora*, when they delay Baptism for some days. 2. *A Sacred Text is read: seeing all things and especially the Sacraments are sanctified by the Word of God and by Prayer.* They therefore Judge it requisite that the Word and Sacraments be conjoynd. 3. *It is made appear that the Covenant of Grace extends also unto the Seed of the Faithful.* They then suppose their Children to be comprehended in the Covenant, and consequently in a salvable Condition antecedently to their Baptism. 4. *The Parents and Sureties do subscribe to this same Covenant, by a publick Profession of Faith, and that also in name of the Child.* And how this Profession can be publick, I understand not, unless it be made in face of the Church Assembled.

It is the Judgement of the Reformed Churches in France, that Baptism be administered either on Sunday or other Sermon days. and that in presence of the Congregation; Seeing Baptism is a solemn reception into the Church. as may be learned from their Liturgie, of Baptism. *Il est à noter qu'on doit apporter les Enfants pour baptizer, ou le Dimanche, ou les autres Jours, au Sermon. afin que comme le Baptême est une Reception solennelle en l'Eglise, il se fasse en la presence de l'Assemblée.* And their constant practice is testified by *Elie Saurin, de la Theologie de Mr. Jurieu Tom. 2. p. 446.* where he accuseth *Mr. Jurieu* of violating their Discipline by baptizing Children in private houses. And p. 627. He confutes *Jurieu's* Opinion of the Efficacy of Baptism, from the constant practice of their Churches who do baptize but in their Assemblies for worship, ad argues thus, 'Si le sentiment de Mr. Jurieu étoit celui de nos Eglises, nous nous rendrions coupables de la plus grande de toutes les cruautés, en attachant le Barême des Enfants a certaines heures, & en refusant de le leur administrer hors de ces heures-là.

That the same Practice is observed in the Churches of Geneva, we have no ground to doubt, seeing the French Liturgie abovementioned was penned by *Calvin*. And *Beza* witnesseth the punctual and religious Observance of it, *Tract. Theolog. de Causa Domini contra Joachimum Westphalum. p. [mihi] 255.* 'Quoniam autem debent in Ecclesia decenter omnia fieri, Baptismum non nisi in Templo, statis horis, per Ministros quotidie administramus. --- Baptismos in privatis ædibus nullos administramus

The like Order and Practice obtains in the Churches of the United Netherlands. In their Publick Liturgie there is no direction for private Baptism, but all is ordered to be done as in the sight and presence of the Congregation. In the *Form of Administring Baptism to Infants*, the Edification of the Congregation is mentioned, as one of the ends of that performance, which supposeth the Congregation present, that is to be edified thereby. The words are, 'Op dat wy dan oock dese Heilige Ordeninge Godts tot sijner eeren, tot onser troost, ende tot sichtiginge der Gemeente uytrichten mogen &c. And in the Form of baptizing the Adult, the Minister requires them to answer sincerely before God and his Church

to the Questions there mentioned. Their Judgement in this doth also further appear from the Doctrine of their Divines concerning the time and place of Baptism: The Professors of *Leiden* (Synopsi pur: Theol: p. 616) teach, that, *Extra persecutionis tempus, publica potius quam privata loca, hinc actiones esse destinanda.* *Petrus van Mastricht* Theol. Theor. Pract. p. 820. 821. 'Locus ordinarius quidem est Ecclesia: --- Quod Baptismus sit Sacramentum introductionis in Ecclesiam, quæ proinde nullibi commodius peragitur quam in Ecclesia. Tempus recepturis, --- non ita determinatum est in Scripturis, nisi quod accurandum omni religione quibulvis incumbat, ut quam primum *ordinatus* fieri potest, impetretur.

The like might be observed of others, if it were needful. *Wusius*, as we heard before (*Exercit. de Efficacia Baptismi* §. 74) Affirms in general of the Reformed Churches, that they use not to administer Baptism, but in publick; And that there are Ecclesiastick Constitutions, almost every where to this purpose. *Reformata Ecclesia Baptismum administrare non solet, nisi statim publicarum Concionum locis ac temporibus. Extantque ea de re ubivis fere Ecclesiastica Constitutiones.* I apprehend *Wusius* may have added this almost [*fere*] with an eye to the Church of *England*, which hath an order for private Baptism, in her Publick Liturgie.

But tho' the Church of *England* alloweth of private Baptism in case of great necessity: Yet she is so much for publick Baptism, that she thinks it good to follow as near as conveniently may be, the custom of the old time, when Baptism was ministred at Easter and Whitsuntide, openly in presence of all the Congregation. See the *Book of Common Prayer, of publick Baptism*: where what follows is further added. 'Wherefor the People are to be admonished, that it is most convenient 'that Baptism should not be ministred but upon Sundays and other Holy days, 'when the most number of People may come together, as well for that the Congregation there present may testify the receiving of them that be newly baptized, 'into the number of Christs Church; As also because in the Baptism of Infants, 'every man present may be put in remembrance of his own profession made to 'God in Baptism.

Yea the Church of *England* is so far convinced of the force and weight of these grounds and reasons, upon which other Reformed Churches have enacted the publick Administration of Baptism; That she hath ordered the Children privately baptized, (if they shall happen to survive) to be brought into the Church, to be solemnly received: where almost all the same Formes and Ceremonies are to be used, as in publick Baptism, except the Dipping in, or Sprinkling with water, and pronouncing the words, *I Baptize thee &c.* See *Book of Common Prayer, in the Head of Private Baptism.*

The Reverend *Usher* Archbishop of *Armagh* accounts it a dishonour done to this Ordinance when it is performed in a private chamber. *Body of Divinity* p. 395. He shews that not only the Papists are to be confuted, but also 'many 'ignorant People amongst us, who for want of better teaching, harbour in their 'minds such Popish conceits, especially that Baptism doth confer grace upon all, 'by the work done (for they commonly look no higher) and they conceive a kind 'of inherent vertue and Christendom (as they call it) necessarily infused into

Children by having the water cast upon their faces. Hence the Minister is oft posted for to baptize in a private chamber, to the dishonour of that Ordinance. And which is more intollerable, in case of the want of a Minister, Women will undertake to be baptizers, which is a monstrous Profanation of so high a Service.

Dr. Tilloson late Archbishop of Canterbury, Sermon 51. *Concerning the Education of Children.* Works pag. 609. 'I know that of late years, since our unhappy confusions, this Sacrament hath very frequently been administred in private. And Ministers have been in a manner, and to avoid the greater mischief of Separation, necessitated to comply with the obstinacy of the greater and more powerful of their Parishoners; who for their ease, or humour, or for the convenience of a pompous Christening, will either have their Children baptized at home by their Minister, or if he refuse, will get some other Minister to do it; which is very irregular.

'Now I would entreat such Persons calmly to consider how contrary to reason and to the plain design of the Institution of this Sacrament, this perverse custom, and their obstinate Resolution in it, is. For is there any Civil Society, or Corporation into which Persons are admitted without some kind of solemnity? And is the privilege of being admitted Members of the Christian Church, and Heirs of the great and glorious promises and blessings of the New Covenant of the Gospel less considerable, and fit to be conferred with less Solemnity? I speak to Christians, and they who are so in good earnest, will without my using more words about it, consider what I say in this particular.

From the short view we have taken of the Judgement, Constitutions, and Practice of other Reformed Churches, concerning the publick Administration of Baptism; we may reasonably infer the following Conclusions. 1. That this Authors Doctrine of the Efficacy and Necessity of Baptism, cannot be the same with that of the Reformed Churches; else they had never so much opposed private Baptism, nor restricted the Administration of this Sacrament to times and places of publick Worship. 2. That Scots Presbyterians have the comfort of being condemned in Company with other Reformed Churches: Seing they maintain the same Doctrine and Practice with them, which this Author impeaches of gross Error and horrid Cruelty. 3. The Mischievous Consequence which he inferreth against the Scots Presbyterians in pag. 15. & 16. [*That, it is to be feared, (were all the Nation Presbyterian) that they would wholly lay aside the Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, as an unnecessary, or indifferent Ceremony, with the solemnity of a Non-obstante*] may with as good reason be drawn against all the Reformed Churches, who maintain the same Doctrine, have enacted the like Constitutions, and observe a correspondent Practice. Tho' I am perswaded, it never entered into the thoughts of any of the Reformed Churches, to abolish this Sacred Ordinance; Nor do I think, that any wise Man, even the most Sagacious was ever hitherto disquieted with such fears, until this Learned Author began prudently to foresee, *the intollerable Mischiefs might be entailed upon Posterity, if his Popish Notions of the Necessity of Baptism were not received.*

Our Author is so fond of this new and witty Conceit, that he repeats it again in his *Specimen of the Method &c.* Where he musters up in Rank and File, the weighty grounds of his vainly conceived fear; viz. The Acts of their General Assemblies against private Baptism, their Practice in obedience to these Acts, and their Doctrine in Defence of both. And concludes, *if this be good Reasoning now, it was so before*: But with his leave, as it was bad Reasoning before, so his repeating of it, hath not mended the matter one whit. For we have already answered all he hath brought against the Doctrine, Constitutions, and Practice of the Church of Scotland about this matter; and have shewed how light and frivolous his weighty grounds are: And the Grounds being removed, his fears founded upon them, become vain and groundless. The known Zeal of this Church from the Reformation hitherto, in preserving the Purity and maintaining the Honour and Reverence due to this Sacrament, doth sufficiently Vindicate her from all Suspicion of any such sinister and pernicious Design of *laying wholly aside* this Divine Ordinance, as an unnecessary and indifferent Ceremony. He may know, moreover that Presbyterians believe, own and profess, that Baptism is a Divine Institution established by Our Lord in His Church unto the end of the World; that the Administration of it is warranted by a Divine Commandment; and that the Children of the Faithful, by reason of their Interest in the Promise of the Covenant, have a Right unto Baptism as a Seal thereof: And if he had considered these things, he might have been quickly freed from his unreasonable Apprehensions, that ever Men of such Principles would abolish this Divine Ordinance with the Solemnity of a *Non-Obstante*: But it seems our Authors beloved opinion of this absolute Necessity, hath got such full and rooted possession in his brains, that he can see no ground, whereupon this Ordinance of Baptism can be maintained, unless his new raised Popish Notion be embraced, which was never received by this Church: Whereas Presbyterians, tho they always impugned the Popish Necessity, have been as zealous in maintaining the perpetual standing Dignity of Baptism, upon the Principles abovementioned, against Socinians, Quakers, and Anabaptists, as ever any Episcopalians were: Nor are they so much enamoured with dispensing Powers, as to arrogate to themselves the Authority of laying aside a Divine Institution with the Solemnity of a *Non-Obstante* *Sed calumniare audacter, aliquid adharebit.*

CHAP III. *Of the irregular Administration of Baptism, and of the Case of dying Infants.*

WHEN the Efforts of Enemies prove unsuccessful one way, they readily attempt another. Perhaps some of the Adversaries of Presbyterians may endeavour to turn the Canon, by charging them with a Violation of their own Discipline, and say, If the Constitutions of the Church of Scotland, be so strict against private Baptism, why are they so little regarded in the present practice of Presbyterians? Seeing it is undeniable, that many Children are Baptised in other

places, than the Parish Church, and at other times, than on Sundays and the set weekly Sermon Days.

To this I Answer in the *First* place, that the Author of this Pamphlet with whom I have to do at present, cannot reckon it a Fault, nor justly blame any upon that account: Seeing according to his Principles (when there is so great danger in delay) every Infant ought to be Baptized, as soon as born; and no Minister should make the least delay, when and wherever required thereto.

But however, if any be guilty of the breach of our Church Order, I am not to undertake a Justification of such Practices, either in People or Ministers. I think people faulty, that seek Baptism to be administered to their Children in private, from an Erroneous Opinion of its absolute necessity, or from a superstitious Conceit of a kind of inherent Vertue and Christendom, necessarily infused into Children by having the water cast upon their Faces, as Bishop *Usher* expresseth it: Nor will I justify these, who seek private Baptism, when their Children are lively, and may without hazard of their Health, be safely brought to the Congregation, to be solemnly received into the Church of Christ in the decent and orderly manner, or who account it a piece of Grandour, to have the Minister brought to their Houses to Baptize their Children; as if any Christian should think it below him solemnly to dedicate his Child unto Christ in the face of the Congregation: Neither can I vindicate others, who slight solemn Occasions, that offer for the orderly Baptizing of their Children, because some things are not so prepared for a publick appearance, as they would have them: And when they have let such Seasons pass, they'll then seek Baptism to their Children in private, at such times as they judge most convenient for the Entertainment they have provided for their Friends. Now in such cases, some Ministers may be induced to step over the strict Rules of our Discipline, partly through the urgent importunity of some persons of Note, partly through the Threatnings of some Parents, that if their Desire be denied, they will take another course, to get Baptism to their Children according to their mind: And if any of the cuted Clergy happen to be in the bounds, they do not readily neglect to embrace such Opportunities, of intruding then selves irregularly upon other Mens Labours, that by such means they may alienate peoples Affections from their lawful Ministers, and engage them to join in separate Meetings: Thus it may be, some Ministers, to prevent Divisions and Rents in their Congregations, have been prevailed upon, to comply with the irregular desires of some of their people; but I shall not altogether excuse the practice.

Mean while it is further to be noticed, that Baptism may be administered, in other places, than in the Parish Churches, and at other times, than on Sundays and other set days of the Week for Sermon, without any breach of our Ecclesiastick Constitutions. For the *General Assembly* in their Act against private Baptism, dated *October 31. 1690.* have added a special Limitation in these Words 'and appoints that this be carefully observed, when and wherever the Lord giveth His people Peace, Liberty and Opportunity for their publick Assemblies. So that Baptism in private is hereby allowed, in times of Persecution, and in such cases when there is not Liberty and Opportunity for publick Assemblies. Our Church-

Constitu-

Constitutions do no where confine Baptism to a fixed Font or the Fabrick of a material Church, but wherever the Congregation is assembled, whether in the open fields or under a roof, there is the Church: And as a Minister may teach in any corner of his Parish, so it is plain that Baptism is more publicly administered in a private House, where a multitude is convened, than in a Parish Church where a few invited Witnesses only are present: Nor do the Acts of Assembly restrict Baptism to Sundays, or other set weekly Sermon Days, but allow the Administration of it at any time when the Congregation is met for Worship: All which is clear from the abovementioned Act of Assembly 1690 where is explained, what is to be understood by the Administration of Baptism in private, *that is, in any place or at any time when the Congregation is not orderly called to wait on the Dispensing of the Word.* And seeing the Ministers Catechising is a Dispensing of the Word, I see nothing in this Act that discharges the Administration of Baptism at a publick Catechising, when the people are orderly called together thereto: From all which we may observe how everly our Author hath read the Acts of General Assemblys, when he gives out that they restrict Baptism to set preaching Days, and page 15. "That our Presbyterian Brethren have already, in great measure established the Iniquity by a Law, by making Acts of their General Assemblies against the Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism in private, *that is in Houses &c.* Whereas the Act of Assembly he points at, explains it self as we shewed already, without any mention of Houses.

Our Author hath a further Quarrel with this Act, that there is no express Exception in it, of the case of dying Infants; Tho this exception is no ways to be made in compliance with his Error, or for his Reason, that Baptism is the only means of putting them into a salvable Condition: Yet this may afford occasion to another Question, which I shall propose and therein offer my Opinion with Submission.

It is this, when that Act of Assembly discharges the Administration of Baptism in private, might there not have been added an express Exception of the case of dying Infants, supposing this privilege of Baptism were sought for them, not out of any Erroneous and Superstitious Opinion of the absolute necessity of Baptism, nor from any disrespect to publick order when it can be observed; but from a Reverence to the Divine Institution, from a conscientious Obedience of the Command of Baptising, and from a dutiful respect to these Graces and Blessings whereof Baptism is a Sign and Seal: When it may tend to the Comfort of the Parents, who earnestly desire this Pledge, of Christs Love, this Seal of the Covenant may be administered to their dear Children, before they depart this Life: And when the whole action is to be performed by a lawful Minister, with the Word and Prayer, before as many as can be conveniently got present?

My opinion shortly is, That it is highly inconvenient to burden general Rules with particular circumstantial Cases, or to make Exceptions that may be misimproved unto a Disregard of the Rule it self whatever may be implied in them: Yet if an explicate Exception had been made of this supposed circumstantial case, I see not how it could be justly quarrelled as a thing in it self sinful. For Illustration I offer the following Considerations.

1. The Administration of Baptism in private is not simply sinful in every case, as appears from Scripture Instances: *Philip* baptised the *Eunuch* by the way side in a Desert *Acts* 8. *Paul* and *Silas* baptised the *Jaylor* and his Family in the night *Acts* 16.

2. It is the general opinion of Divines, that the time and place of administering Baptism is not determined in Scripture; and our first *Book of Discipline* Head 9th saith expressly, *It appertains to the Policy of the Kirk to appoint the times when the Sacraments shall be administered.* And the Assembly *Ann.* 1645, do appoint Baptism to be administered in the face of the Congregation, not as indispensibly necessary, but as *Convenient*.

3. Most of the Grounds and Reasons against private Baptism are obviated in this circumstantial Case: For it is supposed to be sought, not from Error, but Reverence, and therefore will not be used as a Charm. It is supposed to be performed by a lawful Minister, and so the Inconveniencies and evil Consequences that have followed upon private Baptism, may in this case be prevented. It is true it cannot be a Seal of solemn Reception into the Church, nor performed to the Edification of the whole Congregation by their seeing and hearing what is done, seeing it is supposed that the Death of the Infant would prevent the orderly calling together of the Congregation: Yet there being other Ends of this Ordinance attainable, it may be thought eligible, to have this Seal of the Covenant and Token of Reception into the Church, conferred in such decent manner as circumstances will allow, rather than to have it altogether omitted.

4. Baptism being a Divine Institution, and baptizing a commanded Duty; but the circumstance of time and place determinable by the Church: It may seem hard, that a duty enjoined by Divine Authority, should be wholly omitted and neglected when it may be performed, and that only because a circumstance of humane Determination, through inevitable necessity, cannot possibly be observed.

CHAP. IV. Of a most pernicious Error charged upon Presbyterians viz. their adding to the Creed in Baptism.

I Come now to our Authors *third Charge* against the Presbyterians, which he calleth a most pernicious Error, page 16. viz. Their adding to the Creed in Baptism, by requiring of the Parents or Sureties, in name of the Children to be baptized, a Belief of their Confession of Faith, and shorter and larger Catechisms, as if all the Propositions contained in them, were as fundamental as the Articles of the Apostolick Creed.

Here I again desiderate Fair dealing, and that men would be at more pains to inform themselves before they appear in Print, and more regardful of Truth, in what they affirm to the World. The usual engagement Presbyterians require of
Parents

Parents at the Baptism of their Children, is, ' That they promise to train them
' up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and in renouncing the Devil, the
' World and the Flesh; And to bring them up in the knowledge of the grounds
' of the Reformed Christian Religion, which are contained in the Holy Scriptures,
' and more briefly comprehended in their Confession of Faith and Catechisms.

Now pray, what pernicious Error is in all this? Is it that they require Parents to bring up their Children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord and in renouncing the Devil, the World and the Flesh? But I hope he will acknowledge this to be the necessary duty of every true Christian, tho' it be not explicitly contained in the Apostolick Creed. Is it, that Parents are required to teach their Children the Grounds of the Reformed Christian Religion? If there be any fault in this, it must be that too strait bonds are laid upon Parents, that they are not left at liberty to breed their Children *Atheists*, *Papists*, or *Mahometans*. But I think no true Protestant will account this a most pernicious Error. Is it, that they assert the Grounds of the Reformed Christian Religion to be contained in the Holy Scriptures? But surely this will not be judged a most pernicious Error, by him who affirms p. 17. that he believes the Scriptures to be a perfect Rule of Faith and manners. Is it, that they affirm the Grounds of the Reformed Christian Religion to be comprehended in their Confession and Catechisms? Then let him instance the Grounds of Religion necessary to be believed, that are not found in these: Or let him instance any one Article, that is held forth in them, as a ground of the Reformed Christian Religion, which is not contained in the Holy Scriptures.

But what is the ground of his grievous Charge of most pernicious Error in the *Scots* Presbyterians? *They have added to the Creed.* If the compiling of large Confessions and Catechisms be a fault, is it what all the Protestant Churches are equally guilty of. Besides, the Presbyterians pay all due deference to the Apostles Creed, commonly so called, when they have it annexed, entirely and without additions, to their Shorter Catechism, as a *brief Summe of the Christian Faith, agreeable to the Word of God, and anciently received in the Churches of Christ.* But with this necessary Caution, that it is not there annexed, as though it were composed by the Apostles, or ought to be esteemed Canonical Scripture, as the Ten Commandments and the Lords Prayer.

I thought the Practice of Presbyterians in all this matter, had been so plain and simple, that the most severe and sagacious Critick could not have found an Error in it; But our most perspicacious Author can discover most pernicious Errors, where others never dreamed of them, viz. ' Their adding to the Creed in Baptism, by requiring of Parents a Belief of their Confession of Faith and Shorter ' and Larger Catechisms, as if all the Propositions contained in them were as fundamental as the Articles of the Apostolick Creed. This is the most pernicious Error of so pestilential an Influence.

But with his Favour, this is a most groundless accusation. For, 1. It is false that they require Parents to believe all contained in their Confession and Catechisms as fundamentals. They are careful to instruct People in the Doctrines contained in
their

Confession and Catechisms, but they do not teach them that all contained in these, or even in the Scripture it self, are fundamentals necessary to be believed for Salvation. Yea the *Confession of Faith* it self plainly teacheth this Distinction of fundamental and other Truths *Chap. 1. Art. 7.* 'All things in Scripture are not alike plain in themselves, nor alike clear unto all, Yet those things which are necessarily to be known, believed and observed for Salvation, are so clearly propounded &c. 2. If the Articles contained in the Confession and Catechisms, besides the fundamentals, were a Superstructure of most pernicious Errors added to the Foundation, then I think indeed, it would be of pestilential influence, to recommend them to Parents, as a Directory for the instruction of their Children: But seeing he doth not assert this, nor will ever be able to evince it, and seeing these Propositions which are not Fundamental, do nevertheless contain innocent and useful Truths; it can be of no pestilential influence, that these Truths be taught unto Children, nor can it be a most pernicious Error, when Parents are required to bring up their Children in the knowledge of the Grounds of Religion, that a Directory be recommended to them, that contains such Truths, besides the Essentials necessary to be believed for Salvation.

Moreover I observe, that, when Our Author represents the Practice of Presbyterians in the Administration of Baptism, he seems to speak in the Dialect of some other Church, while he says, *They require of Parents or Sureties, in Name of the Children to be baptized, a Belief &c.* And this seems to be a ground of his mistake in this matter. For it is not much in fashion with Presbyterians, to lay the Obligations for the Christian Education of Children, upon Sureties or Godfathers and Godmothers. They think it more suitable, this duty be undertaken by Parents themselves, who are more obliged and more capable to perform it; than by such Sureties who have not the Children in Custody nor under their Authority, and seldom make conscience of enquiring into the Childrens proficiency in the knowledge of Religion and Practice of Piety. Nor do they require Parents or Sureties to believe in Name of Children. They have not that custom of proposing Questions to Infants, *Dost thou forsake the Devil &c. Dost thou believe &c. Wilt thou be baptized in this Faith?* And obliging the Godfathers to give direct answers, *I forsake &c.* as if spoken by the Infants themselves. For tho' such Questions may be very pertinent in Baptizing the Adult, according to the first use of them with Respect to the *Catechumens*: Yet they Judge it most incongruous that Questions be proposed to Infants that cannot answer, and that Answers be given in their Name who have no understanding nor thought about these matters. Nor can they well conceive what Sincerity and Veracity is in these Answers (*I forsake. I believe. I desire.*) Seeing they express no present Truth, nor any certainty for the future. Presbyterians think it sufficient, that Parents be engaged unto faithful endeavours for the Religious Education of their Children, and herein they approve the advice of *Martin Bucer* unto the Church of England, *Censura super Lib. Sacro. Cap. 14. de Catechismo Baptizandorum. p. 480. 481.*

Here I might stop, having said enough on this Subject, Yet finding our Author so fond of this witty Reflexion, that he concludes his *Specimen of the Method &c.* with

with these words, "It seems they find this charge too hard for them, and therefore for they answer it with Silence, and so tacitly acknowledge that it is a gross Error and an Error peculiar to themselves and their late Predecessors: It may not be amiss to enquire more particularly into his Opinions in this Matter, and the Grounds of this Charge, wherein I suppose few Divines in the Reformed Churches will be found to agree with him.

1. He supposeth, that Persons to be baptized ought to be engaged unto the owning of no Divine Truths, but what are Essential, whereof the explicate belief is necessary to Salvation. For he says in p. 16. *I say, an explicate Belief, because such a Belief, of all we ought to be baptized into, is necessary.* Our Author might have brought some proof of this, and not have supposed it as an undoubted maxime. What if a man coming unto the Sacred Font, should in the Confession of his Faith, advance some Propositions that are not essentially necessary unto Salvation, Yet are Divine Truths plainly contained in the Scripture: might not that Man be baptized into the Faith of all that he hath professed? For my part I could not charge our Author with a pernicious Error tho' he should to baptize such a Person. Again our Author will grant that the Explicate Belief of every Article of the Christian Religion as revealed in the Scriptures, is not necessary to Salvation. Now I suppose a Man that truly believes in Christ, is baptized into the whole Christian Religion as revealed in the Scriptures: And I leave him to demonstrate, where the most pernicious Error lyes in baptizing or initiating this Man into the Religion of the Holy Jesus.

2. When he applies this maxime unto the Baptism of Infants, who have no Explicate Belief of any thing, He must suppose [if he say any thing to purpose against the Presbyterians] that it is not to be required of Parents, that they teach their Children any thing of the Christian Religion, besides the Essentials, the Explicate Belief whereof is necessary to Salvation. *But I crave to be informed by him, in what School he hath been taught this Doctrine.* If he pretend to have learned it in the School of Christ, I ask, 1. If Parents may not be required at the Baptism of their Children, to teach them all things, that Christ appointed his Apostles to teach the Persons they baptized in his Name? And if Christ did not require his Apostles to teach them they baptized, *to observe all things whatsoever He had commanded them?* Matthe. 28. 19. 20. Now I hope in all this there is no pernicious Error; Yet I think Our Author will not say, that the Explicate Belief of all things whatsoever Christ commanded his Disciples, is necessary unto Salvation and without which *we cannot be in a salvable Condition.* 2. I ask him if it be not the Duty of Parents to teach their Children some more of the Christian Religion, than the precise Fundamentals that are of absolute necessity to be explicitly believed? And if this be the Duty of Parents, may they not at the Baptism of their Children be required to perform their Duty?

3. He supposeth all the Fundamentals of the Christian Faith, to be expressly contained in the *Apostolick Creed*; else the adding to it in Baptism were no pernicious Error: But I judge this will not readily be granted him, by any who consider, that amongst all the Articles of this Creed, there is not that main Fundamen-

mental, which our Author page 17 sayes, *he beleives as firmly as our Presbyterian Brethren can do*; that the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, neither doth it mention the Fall and Misery of Man, nor the Article of our Justification by Faith without the Works of the Law, nor the Doctrine of Repentance and Renouncing the Devil, nor of the Necessity of Free Grace for our Living unto God. Will any orthodox Christian aver, that the adding of these Fundamentals in Baptism were a most pernicious Error? Yet this were an adding to the Creed with a Witness. The Necessity of Baptism is a very Fundamental Article in our Authors opinion, as all may see who read his Pamphlet; yet being wanting in this Creed, might he not allow the adding of it in Baptism, without any hazard of running into a most pernicious Error? I have the Charity for him, to beleive, that the Esteem he hath of his own beloved Opinion, will not allow him to think, it would be of most pestilential Influence, if at least this one single Article were borrowed from the *Constantinopolitan Creed*, and added to the Apostolick in Baptism, *ὡς ἐμολογῶμεν ἐν Βασιλικῇ.*

4. When our Author teaches to Baptize into the Apostolick Creed, it is his Opinion, that nothing is contained in the Creed, but what is Essential, and that the Explicite Belief of every thing therein contained is necessary: Else there should be an adding unto the Essentials of Faith in the very Creed it self, and it would prove a most pernicious Error to require a Belief of the Creed in Baptism. For our Author says *an explicite Belief of all we ought to be Baptised into, is necessary*. Now will he be so rigid, as to exclude all from a salvable Condition, who do not explicitly believe, that our Saviours Sufferings happened under the Government of *Pontius Pilate*? If he shall say, this of *Pontius Pilate* is not an Article, but a Circumstance explaining an Article. I grant it. nevertheless he must acknowledge, it is an Accessory and not an Essential of Faith; and therefore we ought not to be Baptised into it, according to his Opinion, nor into the Creed it self, while this accessory Clause remains in it. Again, if one shall sincerely believe, that Jesus Christ suffered, was Crucified, Dead and Buried, will he be so cruel as to damn such an one to Hell, if he hath not also an explicite Belief that our Saviour descended into Hell? And when the Meaning of this Article is so much debated amongst Divines, both as to the Intention of the Authors of it, if they understood it of a local Descent, when they added it to this Creed; and also as to what convenient Sense can be put upon it, as it stands placed therein, if it shall be understood of our Saviours Agony and Soul Sufferings, or of his being in the State of the Dead: Will he exclude a Man from Heaven and a salvable Condition, who is in other things a sincere Believer, for want of an explicite Belief of a most ambiguous Article? Wherefore, according to his own Principles, he runneth himself into that same most pernicious Error, he charges the Presbyterians with; if he shall allow any to be Baptised into the Apostles Creed, while this ambiguous Article is retained in it.

5. Our Author plainly supposeth, that the Apostolick Creed, and no other, is to be used in Baptism, for the most pernicious Error of Presbyterians, is, that they add to this Creed in Baptism. Now this is either the will of GOD, or not, if

if it be not the Will of GOD, there can be no pernicious Error in the Non-Observance of it; if it be the Will of GOD, then surely there must be some intimation thereof given unto us in the Divinely Inspired Scriptures, which (as he acknowledges p. 17.) do contain the whole Will of GOD, to the Children of Men, and are therefore a perfect Rule of Faith and Manners. But finding nothing of this in my Bible, I must leave it to our Authors more accurate Scrutiny, to find out, where, in all the Scriptures, the use of this Symbole and of no other is enjoined in Baptism, or where the adding of any thing to it in Baptism is forbidden; or that at least he give one instance, where this Creed, as we now have it, was used in Baptism by the Apostles, or any Minister of the Gospel in their time. The Grounds of this his Opinion are, that at Baptism the explicate owning of all the Essentials of Faith, and nothing else, is to be required, and that the Apostolick Creed contains all and only the Essentials of Faith. These we have examined already. I find no other proof he adduceth, but the Testimony of his Eminent Roman Doctor, Cardinal *de Lugo*, who gives it as the sense of that Church, that *at Baptism there needs no Instruction against Hereticks*. But I am afraid the Authority of his Eminency shall go short way, towards the convincing of stiff and obstinate Protestants, of a most pernicious Error, when no proof can be adduced against them from the perfect Rule of Faith and Manners.

6. It is his Opinion, that no new Article ever was added, and that nothing ought to be added unto this Creed: it being the compleat and adequate measure of the Essentials of Faith. For he saith page 17. That, 'tho' the Ancient Fathers and Councils found it necessary (because of some pestilent Heresies) to explain some Articles of the Creed of the Apostles, commonly so called; yet they added no new ones to it. And if Men once assume the liberty to go beyond the Apostolick Creed for the Essentials of Faith, 'tis hard to know where they shall stop, and the Faith of Christians may, at length, be as variable as the Eb-
bing and Flowing of the Sea. Here several things are advanced without any warrant or proof. As 1. He must hold that this Creed is of equal Authority with the Holy Scriptures (which tho' our Author owns to be a perfect Rule of Faith, yet it seems it is not the only Rule,) and that it was designed and given forth to be, and the Church obliged to receive it, as, a compleat and adequate Systeme of all the Essentials of Faith, seeing none may assume the liberty to go beyond it. And consequently he must hold that this Creed of the Apostles, commonly so called, was composed, as we now have it, by the Divinely Inspired Apostles themselves, for if it were of mere human Composure, it could not be of such Authority, as to confine all Christians within its limits for the Essentials of Faith. Now tho' some Popish Doctors have adopted such Opinions, yet I know few Reformed Divines who do herein agree with our Author. I purpose not to stay upon a full refutation of them, but the Reader that desires further satisfaction may consult. *Gub. Voetius Disputationum select. Vol. 1. De Symbolo Apostolico. Ger. Joan. Vossius de tribus Symbolis. Herm. Witsius Exercitat. in Symbolum Apostolicum. Joh. Hen. Heidegger Dissert. Select. Tom. 2. de Symbolo Apostolico*, and others, who have so irrefragably demonstrated the falsehood of these Popish Fables,

that some of the more ingenuous of the Romish Doctors have yielded unto the force of the invincible Truth. See *Du pin* Bibliotheque, Tom. 1. concerning this Symbole. 2. When he affirms, that 'tho' the Ancient Fathers and Councils found it necessary to explain some Articles of the Creed of the Apostles, commonly so called, yet they added no new ones to it: I suppose by these Explications he may understand the *Nicene, Constantinopolitane, Athanasian*, and such other Creeds, and that this Apostolick Creed was prior to, and more Ancient than all others, seeing in these, some of its Articles were only explained against some Perilous Heresies then arising. But I think it no way credible, there should have been so many different Creeds in the several Churches, more defective and less perfect than this, if it had been delivered [as our Author Judges] unto the Church Catholick, to be the inviolable standart of the Essentials of the Faith. The Learned *Frederick Spanheim* F. Argues against the Fabulous Original and Antiquity of this Symbole from the silence of the most Genuine Writers in the first four Centuries, *Operum* Tom. 1. *Histor. Ecclesiast.* p. 539 *Sed Traditionis vanitatem arguunt.* 1. *Silentium Luca in Actis Apostolicis.* - - - 2. *Silentium omnium vetustiorum.* *non in veteribus, Iustini Martyris, Irenaei, Clementis Alex. Origenis, Tertulliani, Eusebii, Hilarii, Cyrilli Hieros, &c. Quatuor fere primis à Christo nato seculis.* *Du pin* from *Ruffinus* exhibites a Table wherein three different Copies of the Creed, viz. that of *Aquileja*, the *Oriental*, and the *Roman*, are compared with the vulgar now in use; and it is found to contain more Articles than any of the other three. I shall only instance some defects in the Roman, and Additions made in our present Vulgar Creed. In the 1. Art. the Roman hath, *I believe in God the Father Almighty*: our present adds, *Maker of Heaven and Earth*. In the 4th. Art. the Roman hath only, *Crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried*: our present adds to it thus, *Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was Crucified, Dead and Buried, he descended into Hell*. In the 9th Art. The Roman hath only, *I believe the Holy Church*. Our present hath, *the Holy Catholick Church, the Communion of Saints*. The last Article of *Life everlasting* is wanting in the Roman, which is found added in our present. By this short hint, our Author may perceive, that some (whoever they have been) in the Ancient Church, have assumed the Liberty to add *New Articles* to the Creed, before it arrived to its present Pitch and Stature. But 3. This Creed being brought to its present perfection, our Author apprehends great danger in going beyond it for the Essentials of Faith, and that in so doing, the Faith of Christians may, at length, be as variable as the Ebbing and Flowing of the Sea. I grant, if this Creed were the Divinely approved Standart, and if Christians had no infallible Rule besides, whereby to measure the Essentials of Faith; there might be danger in going beyond it. But blessed be GOD, we have a more perfect Rule of Faith, the Holy Scriptures; and while we keep by this Rule, and advance nothing as Essential or necessary to be believed unto Salvation, but what is determined to be such by Scripture; I am not afraid of the Faith of Christians that it shall become so variable as he apprehends. However from what hath been said formerly, it appears, that, this Creed is not a perfect System of Essentials,

tials, but that some very Essential Articles [abovementioned] might be added to it.

7. He asserts, that this practice of Presbyterians, in adding to the Apostolick Creed in Baptism, is 'contrary to the constant and universal sense and practice of the Christian Church in all Ages from the beginning to this day, P. 17. I appeal to the Consciences of all &c. Much of what is here supposed, being already obviated, in what hath been formerly observed: I shall only in the first place, demand of our Author, one single document from the first three Centuries, for proving this alledged universal practice, that the Apostolick Creed in its present compoture, was then used by the Church in Baptism. Next, I might appeal also to all the Reformed Churches; but I shall content my self with the sole Instance of the Church of England, Her practice in the Administration of Baptism, as held forth in the *Book of Common Prayer*. Where we may observe several Additions made to the Creed in Baptism, which is the very Fault our Author charges upon the Scots Presbyterians, as 'a most pernicious Error peculiar to themselves and their Predecessors of no Authority. In the Priests Speech to the God-Fathers and God-Mothers before Baptism, it is said, 'These Infants must promise by you that be their sureties, that they will forsake the Devil and his Works, and constantly believe Gods Holy Word, and obediently keep his Commandments. These things being wanting in the Creed; the requiring them of Infants is as much an adding to the Creed in Baptism, as when Presbyterians require the Parents to teach the same things unto their Children. In the Catechism, of the persons to be Baptized, the first Question is, *Doe'st thou forsake the Devil, &c.* Now this forsaking the Devil, the World and the Flesh, belongs to the Doctrine, of Repentance, whereof there is no Article in the Creed. In the Exhortation unto the God-Fathers and God-Mothers after Baptism, the Priest lays upon them as their duty "to provide that the Infants, for whom they have promised, may learn the Creed, the Lords Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in the English Tongue. and all other things which a Christian Man ought to know and believe to his Souls health. It seems in the Judgement of the Church of England, there are some other things besides the Creed, which a Christian ought to know and believe for his Souls Health. And if *She* add these things to the Creed in Baptism, by requiring the Sureties to provide that the Children may Learn them; can it be reckoned a more pernicious Error in Presbyterians to lay the like duty on the Parents themselves? Moreover "the Minister is to command that the Children be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed, so soon as they be instructed in the Catechism, set forth for that purpose. That Catechism contains many Truths besides the Articles of the Creed. Such are, "Mans inability of himself to do the Commandments. and to serve God, without his special Grace: And the Doctrine of the *Two Sacraments*, where, (by the way) The Lords Supper is said to be generally necessary to Salvation, as well as Baptism. Is there not in all these an adding to the Creed in Baptism with a Witness? And when Presbyterians do no more, but require Parents faithfully to perform their duty, by instructing their Children in the Grounds of Religion, according to the Holy Scripture, and their

their Confession and Catechisms, that are agreeable thereto: I submit it to the impartial Judgement of the unbiassed Readers, if this be a *Gross Error*, and an Error peculiar to the *Scottish Presbyterians*.

CHAP. V. *Of the unwarrantable Grounds of Separation from the present Established Church.*

HAVING canvassed all the Grounds of this Authors charge against the Presbyterians, with respect to their Doctrine and Practice, about the Sacrament of Baptism; I come in the last place, according to the method I proposed, to enquire, if the Reasons he hath offered be sufficient to warrant a Separation from the Worship of this Established National Church, and to make Legal Toleration necessary in favours of the separate Meetings of these of the Episcopal persuasion. And this Authors Three *Weighty Reasons* against joining in Communion with Presbyterians, having been in the preceeding Discourses, severally weighed and found light, our present enquiry may be the more quickly discussed.

I very much doubt, if these of the Episcopal persuasion, who have lately deserted the Communion of this Church, have done so upon the Grounds mentioned by our Author. He is the first, for what I know, who hath affirmed it; and the first who undertook to justify their Separation by such Grounds and Reasons.

I shall briefly run them over. 1. He charges the Presbyterians with Error in Doctrine concerning the necessity of Baptism. Now this can be no justifiable ground for these of the Episcopal persuasion to separate from Communion in Worship with this National Church; For besides that every Error will not justify a Separation from the Church that maintains it: I have abundantly evinced in the first part of this Discourse, that the Doctrine of Presbyterians in this point is sound and orthodox, and that the Error is on our Authors side, and it was never yet pretended that sound Doctrine could justify a Separation. Moreover I have cleared, that the Doctrine of Presbyterians in this matter is maintained by all the Reformed Churches, and that his Opinion is Popish; wherefore, if he shall make this a Reason of separating from Presbyterians. He may on the same Ground renounce Communion with all Reformed Churches, and go straight over to Rome, where his own Doctrine is taught. 2. He charges Presbyterians with *refusing universally to Baptise, except on Sundays and other set Preaching Days of the Week.* But besides the mistakes and falsehoods I have already observed in this charge; tho' it were true, and that there were an Error herein, yet it could be of no such moment as to warrant a Separation. Seeing it would be only an Error in the practice of an Ecclesiastick Constitution, about a matter determinable by the Church according to the Rule of Decency and order. As also upon the same ground Communion must be refused with all Reformed Churches, who observe

serve the order of publick Baptism. 3. He charges Presbyterians with a most pernicious Error, P. 16. "which puts an invincible Bar in the way of all Orthodox, judicious and considering Protestants to join in Communion with them, viz. their adding to the Creed in Baptism, by requiring of the Parents &c. The falsehood of this, with the Grounds whereon he builds it, hath been so plainly exposed already, and the practice of Presbyterians in the manner of Administering Baptism so fully vindicated from the Calumnious Aspersions of most pernicious Error, that I hope no Orthodox and Judicious Christian will ever separate from Communion in Worship with them, on that account: Besides I have evinced, that upon the same Grounds, he may charge the Church of *England* with the like pernicious Error in adding to the Creed in Baptism: So that hereby he hath put an invincible Bar in his own way of joining in Communion with *Her*, if in practice he walk by his own principles.

To conclude, if all the *Weighty Reasons* he hath offered to justify the present course of some of the Episcopal persuasion, in separating from the publick and Established Worship of this National Church, be so false and frivolous, the Separation it self must be wilful and groundless, and if a wilful and groundless Separation from the Communion of a true Church, be *Schism*: then I leave it to the World to judge, on whose side the Sinful *Schism* is to be Lodged.

F I N I S.

Let the order of public Baptism. 3. The charge Presbyterian with a most
 pernicious Error, 4. 16. which puts an invincible Bar in the way of all Catho-
 licks, judicious and considering Protestants to join in Communion with them.
 "we then adhere to the Creed in Baptism, by receiving of the Sacrament &c.
 The substance of this with the Grounds whereon he builds it, shall be seen to
 plainly exposed clearly and the charges of Presbyterians in the manner of Adam.
 illustrating Baptism to fully vindicate from the charge of a Christian will ever be
 vicious Error, that I have no Orthodox and Judicious Christian will ever be
 from Communion in Worship with them, on that account: Besides I have evin-
 ced that upon the same Grounds, he may charge the Church of England with the
 like pernicious Error in adding to the Creed in Baptism, so that thereby he hath
 put an invincible Bar in his own way, as he hath done in the same manner with this.
 To conclude, if all the World should be obliged to justify the present
 course of some of the English Churches, in separating from the publick and
 Established Worship of the National Church, he to this and thenceforth, the Sepa-
 ration itself must be willful and groundless, and it is willful and groundless Sepa-
 ration from the Communion of a true Church, be it what it will: then I leave it to the
 World to judge, on whole the sinful system is to be lodged.



